

Minutes
November 16-17, 2006
Red Lion Hotel on 5th Avenue, Seattle, WA

November 16, 2006

Members Present: June Canty, Roger Erskine, Shannon Espinoza, Kathryn Nelson, Dora Noble, Sharon Okamoto, Grant Pelesky, Stephen Rushing, Ron Scutt, Dennis Sterner, Yvonne Ullas, Stacy Valentin, Jill Van Glubt, Donna Zickuhr

Members Absent: Terry Bergeson, Carol Coar, Gary Cohn, Vicki Frei, Martha Rice

Staff Present: Esther Baker, Dr. Lin Douglas, Gina Hobbs, Nasue Nishida, Jennifer Wallace

The meeting was called to order by Chair Van Glubt at 8:33 a.m.

- Consent Agenda
 - Agenda
 - Approval of minutes from PESB September 20-21 meeting
 - Approval of minutes from PESB Special November 2 meeting
- Announcements

8:34:59 AM

MOTION

Approve consent agenda with noted corrections to September minutes. ***Motion carried.***

Chair Van Glubt reminded members of the parliamentary procedure sheets and the updated action sheets provided in member binders. She described the process for making motions, having discussions, asking clarifying questions, and voting.

Mary Jean Ryan, Chair, State Board of Education (SBE):

Chair Ryan welcomed everyone to Seattle. She works as a policy director for the City of Seattle and her personal passion is working on education and trying to figure out ways to improve it; helping kids so they can lead productive lives. With the new State Board of Education comes new mandates and goals from the Legislature to work on accountability and provide strategic oversight of K12. Embedded in legislation is the mandate to complete an annual report each year with the PESB. The SBE is very interested in working closely with the PESB on the annual report and the math action report. The work the PESB does is the single most important component of a great education system. Chair Ryan mentioned that she would like to get to know the PESB and possibly have a joint meeting together with the SBE. The SBE has been working with the PESB on the Math Action Report. The most important thing is what we are going to do as a system to raise math competency in the state; it will take collaboration with SBE, PESB, OSPI and the Legislature. Chair Ryan briefed the PESB on what's coming up next for the SBE, including Science, accountability framework for K12 in the State of Washington, and high school graduation requirements.

The redesigned PESB web site launched this week. Check it out at: www.pesb.wa.gov

ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF PESB PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Dr. Lin Douglas, Interim Executive Director, PESB
Roger Erskine, PESB member

Dr. Douglas provided a refresher on the information that was presented at the September meeting. She highlighted the changes that were made since that meeting and the subcommittee's recommendations:

ISSUE	RECOMMENDATION
1. WAC 181-78A-100(b) – provision for the assignment of substitute members on the site visit team and clarification of who are “practitioners”	a. Language added regarding substitutes. b. Clarifying language added to specify “K-12 practitioners.”
2. Program Site Visit Process – the assignment of substitute members, WEA observers on site visits, conflict of interest	a. Item 6 was revised. Items 7 and 8 were added to the process.
3. WAC 181-78A-110 – board program approval options based upon the review of existing programs	a. Identified the following options for length of approval: one year, five years (non-NCATE institutions), seven years (NCATE institutions), or disapproval.

In addition, in anticipation of teacher preparation programs seeking reapproval based on revised endorsement competencies, the subcommittee developed changes to WAC 181-82A-206.

PESB will be the deciding body with respect to the actions being taken. There will be a distinction between institutions requesting to extend programs and implement new programs. The PESB wants to make sure institutions are prepared and are doing their best possible work. The new web site gives us the opportunity to make this process transparent. The charts and templates will be posted on the web site to provide guidance for institutions coming forward.

9:04:01 AM

MOTION

Approve the site visit process and proposed WAC changes to WACs 181-78A-100, 105, 110, and 206. ***Motion carried.***

DISCUSSION OF PLAN AND TIMELINE FOR REVIEW OF PROGRAM APPROVAL STANDARDS

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Dr. Hett gave an informational PowerPoint presentation on the review of Standard V, knowledge and skills for teachers.

The legislature passed a bill stating that the program approval standards should be reviewed every five years. The first standard to be reviewed will be standard V, Knowledge and Skills for teachers. After further discussion and analysis with the PESB executive committee, it was determined that a thorough and thoughtful review of Standard V could not be completed by December 2006. An extended timeline provides the opportunity to: 1) incorporate Washington Learns recommendations; 2) address specific recommendations contained within the PESB “Comprehensive Analysis Report”; and, 3) make a major paradigm shift from a performance-based teacher certification system to an evidentiary-based system.

It is anticipated that Washington Learns will make recommendations related to teacher preparation. Preliminary recommendations include: “build cultural understanding of our diverse student population,” “update the technology requirements for teacher preparation,” and “teachers trained in and actively engaged in putting creativity and imagination at the core of all subjects.” Extending the timeline will ensure that the review and revision process adequately addresses Washington Learns recommendations related to teacher preparation.

“Washington’s System of Preparing and Certifying Educators, “ published by the PESB in December 2005, noted that while the state has adopted 25 common knowledge and skills standards, there are “no consistent performance expectations, no common set of evidences that define what program completers need to know and be able to do across all preparation programs.” Extending the timeline will ensure that a set of common learner outcomes can be developed.

Lastly, extending the timeline will facilitate the transition from a “performance-based” teacher certification system, focused on what teachers do, to an “evidentiary” or “evidence-based” system, focused on what students are doing when teacher candidates are meeting the learner outcomes/standards. This represents a major shift in how we prepare future teachers by explicitly connecting student voice/ product “evidence” to learner outcomes which can be analyzed to determine if teacher candidates are meeting the knowledge and skills standards. This shift is consistent with what is required for professional certification and is consistent with what we ask K-12 students to do. This shift has the potential to transform teacher preparation in Washington.

Given these factors the proposed timeline has been expanded to conduct the review of Standard V. The review of Standards I-IV is scheduled for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Dr. Hett also provided timelines for the review of Standards I – IV.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

PESB members questioned the process for selecting the review committee and the cost to cover these reviews. Dr. Hett told the PESB the cost would be covered using certification fees. Members also questioned how the evidentiary based system would work and expressed interest in being trained how to collect and assess evidence.

REVISED PLAN FOR REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF TEACHING ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification (PEC), OSPI

Dr. Hett gave an informational PowerPoint presentation on the plan for reviewing the teaching endorsement competencies.

The current endorsement competencies were established in 2000. The PESB and PEC office are proposing a plan for the ongoing review of the endorsement competencies to be certain they are current and reflect our K-12 standards. The plan is based on experience reviewing several endorsements during 2006 and the question/information requests from the PESB.

A review of the endorsement competencies is motivated by several factors:

- Revision/addition of content standards
- Selection of a new WEST-E vendor
- Highly Qualified Teacher requirements
- Development of an assessment system for endorsement competencies

Dr. Hett will come back to the PESB in January 2007 to present eleven revised endorsements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sheila Fox, State Board of Education (SBE):

Thank you, it's a pleasure to be here. I feel like I'm a professional sleeve-tugger these days; I'm tugging a lot of sleeves. When I sit on the SBE I'm often reminded when we get into conversations, there are some topics we bring up that are really the territory of the PESB. Today, I'm here to talk about something, I think, has implications for the PESB. It's also on the agenda at the SBE and OSPI. Tug, tug, tug. I really appreciated the remarks made by Mary Jean Ryan this morning because I do think we need to think of ourselves as partners in a system and one of the partners is OSPI, one is the PESB, and one is the SBE. As I listened to the discussion a little bit ago about endorsements, especially in math, there were all kinds of bells going off in my head related to conversations we're having at the SBE. We are indeed thinking about what we are going to do about math performance in the state; what changes can we make that will improve the system for those students who currently are not successfully passing the WASL exam. I'm not giving you a preview of what our decisions are because I don't know what the SBE decisions ultimately will be, but I can tell you that one of the things we're thinking about is whether we ought to require, for high school graduation, three years, not two years, of mathematics. If we do that, it has implications for the PESB. For one, we'll need more math teachers. That has recruitment and retention incentive implications and, of course, implications for OSPI as well, and perhaps the HEC Board.

We are one system and we all have the same goal and that is to improve student performance. What we need to figure out is how to work together to reach that goal. One of the things we're considering if we do go to three years instead of two years (not saying that's what we're going to do, but it is getting discussed) is that it may include applied math but not general math. So what do we need in a math teacher that is going to prepare students in the system to pass the WASL? One of the things we may need to do to is back math down into middle level and elementary level, and that matrix that Ron brought up many meetings ago talking about how we need to see how math performance, all performances really, are related grade level to grade level to grade level. What's the congruence for a student as they move through the system is to be very well aware of that sequence. It has implications for endorsements for elementary teachers, for middle level teachers, for high school math teachers and so as you talk about changes in the math requirements around endorsement, I think we need to also keep an eye on actions the SBE will be taking in a short time frame to perhaps change the graduation requirements.

Everything is related to everything and so I guess I would urge, as you move forward on endorsements, to ask the question, "Is the state board making any changes for K12 students that have implications for endorsement requirements for residency teachers?" Make sense? I kind of think of this as a three-legged milking stool. I know that's kind of a country-fied image but that's what we are, it's one system with one goal and that's (well, maybe multiple goals), students who graduate from high school and are well prepared to be successful citizens and that means academic performance as well as just being a good citizen, that has other implications. If I can get just one other example, we are also talking with the tribal units in the state about requiring something for high school graduation that informs our students within the K12 system about Native American sovereignty and local Native culture. If we do that, it may have implications for something like the Social Studies endorsement. So, it's just another example of how actions at one board level have implications for another and for OSPI. I guess this is just a reminder to us to think of ourselves as one family with slightly different roles. Thank you.

Peter Anthony, University of Phoenix (Signed up for public comment; wasn't present)

OPTIONS RELATED TO A PROPOSED UNIFORM STATE-LEVEL ASSESSMENT FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL TEACHING CERTIFICATE

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification (PEC), OSPI
Mary Jo Larsen, Program Specialist for Professional Certification, OSPI
Marilyn Simpson, Director of the IN ACTION Initiative, OSPI

Ms. Larsen shared information about an assessment for the professional certification. This is a follow-up discussion of the presentation given at the September meeting. Ms. Larsen talked about guiding principals and reminded the board of the chart she distributed in September.

Ms. Simpson provided binders to board members titled: Washington State Development IN ACTION: Version Three. Ms. Simpson also showed two videos from students who have developed rubrics to evaluate their homework. She spoke about student achievement and providing evidence of that achievement.

Ms. Larsen gave a presentation on what's been done so far and the plan for putting the rest in place. If the program isn't in line with the expectation, then it's an issue about the program.

- Step one; development
 - Common performance evidence
 - Assessor training
 - Anchor documents
 - Ongoing calibration
- Step two; implementation
 - Double scoring
 - Random sampling
- Step three;
 - Program; system evaluation

11:30:39 AM

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

PESB members questioned the cost of such a system; they want to make sure policy makers have a clear sense of the cost benefit; will it be worth it? We want the programs to be vibrant and effective. Several members shared examples of new teachers who are struggling with their living expenses because the cost of the certification is high.

Chair Van Glubt tabled discussion until after lunch so we could move on to the next item.

STATUS OF K-8 SUBCOMMITTEE AND WASHINGTON'S RESPONSE TO NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Nasue Nishida, Research and Policy Analyst, PESB
Mary Jo Johnson, Director of Title II, OSPI
Ron Scutt, K8 Subcommittee & PESB Member

Dr. Terry Bergeson, Cathy Davidson and Leslie Goldstein, all representing OSPI, joined the meeting by phone for this agenda item.

Ms. Nishida provided background information on the K8 endorsement/committee for new members. The subcommittee is a group of mostly your fellow members; Ron Scutt, Dennis Sterner, Roger

Erskine, Kay Nelson, Stacey Valentin, Lin Douglas, Jennifer Wallace, and Gloria Mitchell (before she left the board), and Larry Lashway and Arlene from PEC. Over the last 10 months the committee has looked at a body of research.

Using four options, the committee spent the last nine months researching the issue and receiving feedback and input from various stakeholder groups.

- **Option 1:** Strengthen the subject knowledge competencies of the K-8 endorsement;
- **Option 2:** Strengthen the subject knowledge competencies of the K-8 endorsement and offer a K-6 endorsement for those preservice candidates not intending to teach middle grades;
- **Option 3:** Change the current K-8 endorsement to K-6, requiring that middle grades teachers earn either a Middle Level Math/Science or Middle Level Humanities endorsement or hold one or more secondary content endorsements.
- **Option 4:** The current system is working and with incremental changes will continue to be successful.

The committee fielded these options with different stakeholder groups via focus groups and meetings. The stakeholder groups included School District Human Resource Directors, Principals, College of Education Deans and Directors, Superintendents/Administrators, Small and Rural Schools Superintendents, and National Board Certified Teachers. The committee synthesized the feedback into thematic categories.

ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES

Phase 1 of the endorsement competency revision process is underway for the subjects contained within the elementary education endorsement. Once those subject areas are completed, Phase 2 will begin to revise the elementary education endorsement competencies. This is slated for January 2007.

MIDDLE LEVEL HIGHLY QUALIFIED DATA

OSPI submitted their NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher Revised Plan including reported data for the 2005 – 06 school year in late September. In particular, analyses of these data reveal information about the placement and preparation of middle school teachers.

Ms. Johnson provided an overview via PowerPoint presentation regarding the Highly Qualified and NCLB reporting updates. She reported that less experienced teachers tend to be placed in high poverty areas. These are collected from all districts; of 296, 80-90% are taught by Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT); 159 of the 269 reported at 100%.

At the elementary level, there are over 20 thousand teachers teaching 30 thousand or more classes. There are twice as many middle school teachers as high school teachers who do not meet HQT. Special Ed teachers at the secondary level, if they're fairly new, and with the way HOUSSSE is set up, will take three years to become HQT. Because a teacher data system does not exist, data are pulled from different systems. The data overwhelmingly says math and reading teachers are not HQT. HQT will not go away with the reauthorization; we may see some minor adjustments.

Mr. Scutt presented several emerging themes from focus groups and stakeholders regarding the K-8 elementary endorsement.

A subcommittee of the PESB identified four general themes that emerged from participants in focus groups and educational stakeholders regarding the adequate content knowledge of middle school teachers holding a K-8 elementary endorsement. Largely, educators voiced support for keeping the K-8 elementary endorsement, but recognized the need to strengthen the preparation of K-8 teachers to

help them meet the challenges of middle level instruction. Feedback and input also identified the concern that changes to this endorsement will have complex effects, both intended and unintended.

There are political issues around math in the legislature; if we don't do something, something will be done. There is value in content and making sure educators have the content to lead a class in their educational expertise. We don't want to have unintended consequences that diminish student achievement.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members questioned what conclusions could be drawn from this data. Is OSPI doing more work to analyze the data? Dr. Bergeson said priorities could be changed to make this happen. Concerns were also expressed regarding the ability to recruit middle school teachers; it's not typically a new teacher's first choice. There is concern that not all administrators know about HOUSSE, it's important to get the word out. Dr. Bergeson said the issue has been plaguing us for years and the data have shaken a lot of people; there's got to be a pathway and a timeline put into place.

INPUT FOR K8 COMMITTEE AND PESB STAFF

The K8 committee is on a fact-finding mission; they aren't ready to make a recommendation at this point. The committee will be well on the way by January 2007. This is a complex array of state and federal policies; it comes down to student achievement and what's best for the students.

Though this was not originally an action item, staff is looking to the board to give the go ahead to develop a timeline to present at the legislative session. The group discussed language for a formal motion; it was moved and seconded.

2:24:23 PM

MOTION

The PESB is committed to improving the content preparation of K8 teachers, particularly in the areas of math, science and reading. To that end, PESB directs the K8 subcommittee and the OSPI endorsement committee to work together and bring to the board a structure for certification and content preparation that will accomplish that goal by July 2007. ***Motion carried.***

DISCUSSION: NEW STATE STANDARDS AND EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR STATE-APPROVED PROVIDERS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION (CLOCK HOURS)

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Joe Egan, Director of Information Technology, OSPI

Ms. Wallace gave some background information on the clock hours policy. The policy requires having a system to ensure providers are meeting the standards. The PESB began talking several years ago about a proposal around a system that would provide a way for clock hours to be provided and posted, and a way to evaluate them. The state looked at a lot of systems; and the PESB likes the OPSI proposal because it's a consumer driven system.

Mr. Egan gave a brief background on his history with this project. He provided a PowerPoint presentation on the teacher data system; it would be phased out of the management system, would include web based administration and events; and would be a centralized place for offering professional development.

E-certification -- so far, OSPI has received 1112 total applications through a personal and secure web based system. The application number is high, and it's known that some people start and don't finish. There are close to 50 applications that teachers can access through the OSPI system. As of November 15th, over 2200 fingerprint checks have been run through the system. The processing time went from 6-8 weeks to only a few hours; that's how much the process has improved.

What we're doing today: working on electronic signatures, legacy data, and support for more types of events, usability study, and budget request for funds \$1.4 million (and change).

What's next: professional development registry, detailed evaluation available to the public, inform future professional development offerings, web based evaluation process, common evaluation tools, connected with online EALRs and GLEs, professional growth planner, clock hour integration and tracking, one system, clock hour registration and tracking, automatic professional development tracking, alignment to WASL and core student data, advisory group (with some PESB members).

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members posed questions about information sensitivity, accessibility, and communication of the changes. Mr. Egan said the data will only be available to the teacher and it will be up to the teacher to decide who else has access to the data. Mr. Egan plans to communicate the changes in the system through several different channels, including the January Conference, the OSPI and PESB web sites, and by word of mouth. He also said you will only have to register in the system once, unlike the current OSPI registration system. The goal of this system is to empower teachers.

PUBLIC COMMENT

David Quinn (See Attachment A for Mr. Quinn's written comments)

(Continued from before lunch)

OPTIONS RELATED TO A PROPOSED UNIFORM STATE-LEVEL ASSESSMENT FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL TEACHING CERTIFICATE

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace revisited the earlier conversation about the various proposals around a pro cert assessment. Staff needs a clear sense of where the board stands on the emerging proposals. Ms. Wallace created a Word table to document pros and cons.

Examples of those pros and cons include:

Pros	Cons
Less cost to candidate if just assessment for earning pro cert? Con on above - Value of mentorship - working with peers - go it alone not as valuable - where's the growth? Assessment alone not enough to determine met standards - we say that for residency cert	More cost to candidates if on top of existing requirements
Result in greater uniformity?	Not valuable to program improvement?
Performance agreements - if want pay bump, need to demonstrate	Won't provide indicators of cost / benefit of pro cert in terms of benefit to students or teachers
Could be valuable IF a National-Board like assessment in terms of quality	But National Board is voluntary and there is a pay bump - it's for accomplished teachers - this is

	second tier license - different level
Assumption is it's a statewide assessment of the candidate - should be of the programs	Is this another hoop that will drive people out of education?
Caution - No rash / quick fix - be thoughtful - maybe pilot the assessment?	Pro Cert was never really intended to be uniform - look different - wrong direction to have a uniform assessment - high quality everywhere - but different
Provide individual teachers valuable information on their professional growth	WEST-P???
Uniformity and potentially valuable indicator - - if greater uniformity, greater clarity about what pro cert is - common experience just one indicator - like idea of portfolio with some indicators	We already have evidence - that should be response to performance agreements - it's a matter of how to present that
	Admit need greater uniformity across programs, but assessment isn't way to get that - program review
	Putting the burden of evidence of program quality on the candidate, not the program
	Take harder look at the data / push on programs that need improvement rather than implement an assessment
	Stop knit picking at it - evaluate either it's working and we continue improvements, or head a new direction - not just add a test Quit constant shifting - lots of little changes / program adjustments - assessment won't get us there
	They already get lots of feedback in the program
	Doesn't matter if it's cheaper if it isn't valuable - value comes from evidence of your impact on students / impact on your teaching

PLANS FOR LEGISLATION RELATED TO PERMANENTLY ESTABLISHING THE FIRST PEOPLES' LANGUAGE/CULTURE CERTIFICATION (FPLC) PROGRAM

Suzi Wright, Education Policy Analyst, Tulalip Tribes

4:34:16 PM

Ms. Wright spoke on the proposed RCW and WAC language for FPLC. They felt they had to put this in RCW so there isn't an oversight. This legislation expands the program, removes jurisdictional issues, and removes ambiguous language relating to the expiration of the certificate. The other jurisdictional issue is the idea of endorsement. This program was intended to establish that the tribes are the endorsers, there are no other experts. This language clarifies that it cannot be categorized as a world language. There is also a requirement for consultation. Teachers living on the reservation will be contracted to be trained on the reservation. Representative Mike Sells is sponsoring the bill in the House, not sure if it will be dropped in the Senate.

To clarify, Ms. Wallace stated that the PESB won't submit the legislation; they will make recommendations, consider them, and then make changes in WAC.

4:45:44 PM

SETTING CUT-SCORE FOR THE DEAF EDUCATION PRAXIS II

Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments, PESB
Jerry Deluca, ETS Client Services Director

Mr. Deluca provided the PESB with history for new members, along with an overview of the review process. Ms. Baker and Mr. Deluca presented results of the job relevance and validation study conducted in October on the Praxis II exam, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, used for the Deaf Education endorsement.

After much research and data collection, the recommendation is to set the passing score to 167.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members questioned the score of 167 and mentioned that Oregon's passing score is only 144. Mr. Deluca talked about how there are many factors that determine passing scores for each state.

5:05:32 PM

MOTION

Approve the recommended passing score of 167. ***Motion carried.***

Chair Van Glubt adjourns for the day

DRAFT Minutes

November 17, 2006

8:33:18 AM

Members Present: June Canty, Roger Erskine, Shannon Espinoza, Kathryn Nelson, Dora Noble, Sharon Okamoto, Grant Pelesky, Stephen Rushing, Ron Scutt, Dennis Sterner, Yvonne Ullas, Stacy Valentin, Jill Van Glubt, Donna Zickuhr

Members Absent: Terry Bergeson, Carol Coar, Gary Cohn, Vicki Frei, Martha Rice

Staff Present: Esther Baker, Dr. Lin Douglas, Gina Hobbs, Nasue Nishida, Jennifer Wallace

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Van Glubt called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

UPDATES FROM MEMBERS

8:33:44 AM

Roger Erskine updated the members on a few conferences and meetings he has attended. Those included the State Board of Education meetings, the NBCT Policy Summit, and the NES Annual Conference.

8:42:29 AM

Dennis Sterner updated the members on his attendance at the Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (WACTE) conference. WACTE requested a meeting with PESB Executive Committee.

8:51:02 AM

Dr. Lin Douglas provided an update on the Executive Director recruitment. A consultant has been hired to help with the recruitment effort. She's confident there will be a pool of candidates to interview on December 8, 2006.

8:53:53 AM

LEGISLATIVE PREVIEW

- PESB Response to Final Washington Learns Report
- Joint SBE/PESB Math Action Plan
- OSPI Budget/Policy Request Package Items Related to PESB

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Nasue Nishida, Research and Policy Analyst, PESB

Dr. Lin Douglas, Interim Executive Director and Alternate Routes Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace summarized PESB's budget requests and also mentioned the OSPI budget request for \$1.8 billion. She prefaced the presentation with a brief summary of the WA Learns meeting on November 13; the final report is included in your board packet.

Ms. Nishida summarized the WA Learns recommendations.

Washington Learns Recommendations Charged to the PESB

1. By **Dec. 2007**, the PESB will adopt new math and science knowledge requirements for people entering teacher preparation programs, and certification requirements for math teacher in middle and high schools that will prepare them to teach state math and science standards. (page 22)
2. Subject to appropriations, by **June 2008**, the PESB will expand the Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification Program for business professionals and instructional assistants to be licensed to teach math and science (page 22).
3. By **Dec. 2009**, the PESB will review teacher preparation requirements in cultural understanding, will make recommendations for strengthening these standards, and will also recommend strategies to increase educator diversity. (page 26)
4. Subject to appropriations, by **June 2009**, the PESB will set performance standards and develop, pilot and implement a professional teaching level assessment and licensing system based on demonstrated teaching skill.
5. By **June 2009**, the PESB will revise the requirements for college and university teacher preparation programs to match the new knowledge- and skill-based performance system.
6. By **July 2007**, a state committee will begin development of a professional performance-based educator salary system and will identify the elements and support systems necessary for implementation. The committee will involve teacher and administrator groups, the PESB, OSPI, OFM and the Legislature.

Washington Learns Recommendations Related to PESB Work

1. The Dept. of Early Learning will work with higher education institutions and OSPI to develop strategies for substantially increasing the availability of early learning teacher training. Among the issues that will be addressed are: credit for community-based training and experience, transfer of credits across institutions, availability of classes in rural communities and during evening and weekend hours, a stronger link between early learning courses in high school and early learning careers, and math and science education for early learning teachers.
2. Subject to appropriations, startup funds will be provided for competitive grants to create career academies in WA high schools. **By Jan. 2008**, the P-20 Council will develop a request for proposals for these academies. Career academies will offer 11th and 12th grad students the opportunity to focus their studies and training on a particular occupational field....
3. Subject to appropriations, we recommend that the 2007 – 09 budget direct investments in colleges and universities to high-demand apprenticeship, certificate and degree programs.
4. The Governor will create a P-20 Council by Exec. Order. The council will be chaired by the Governor. Membership on the Council will include OSPI, the Exe. Dirs. of the Dept. of Early Learning, SBE, PESB, SBCTC, HECB, WTEDCB, Council of Presidents, Independent Colleges of WA, and a rep. of the state's tribal schools and colleges. OFM will support and staff the P-20 Council.
5. **By Dec. 2007**, OSPI, in consultation with OFM and the Legislature, will develop a new teacher compensation reporting structure that will provide a complete picture of teacher salaries in WA.
6. Subject to appropriations, beginning with the 2007 – 08 school year, the teacher salary allocation model will include pay for performance, knowledge and skills.
7. **By 2008 – 09 school year**, OSPI will work with civic leaders, AWSP, WASA and others to establish a public-private partnership to launch a leadership academy for principals and other administrative staff.

9:11:04 AM

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members discussed questions related to leadership and performance based pay. There are lots of different models for performance based pay, none of which have been singled out at this point. From the PESB perspective, there may be a lack of alignment between a salary system based on accumulated credits [time and service] and a system of preparation certification that's becoming increasingly performance based.

9:32:39 AM

Ms. Nishida highlighted OSPI's budget proposals and talked about how they relate to PESB work.

1. Center of Education Excellence
2. Mentor and coaching academies
3. Novice teacher assistance program
4. Instructional coaches for math
5. Expand principal mentorship and internship
6. Learning improvement days
7. Knowledge and skills-based pay
8. Financial incentives to attract excellent teachers for hard-to-staff schools and subjects
9. Recognition for prior non-school experience for ESAs and CTE instructors.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members discussed questions related to who would attend these mentor academies, new teachers being brought in to mentor more experienced teachers, and how they plan to replace teachers that are now math coaches since there is already a shortage of math teachers.

9:54:55 AM

Dr. Douglas presented the joint math action plan. She would like to know whether the board will adopt and support the current plan as written so she can notify the State Board of Education at their meeting on November 27 and the plan can be finalized for submission to the Governor's Office.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Some members feel math should be part of every subject taught in schools; integrated throughout the curriculum. One possibility is that math could be placed in the content areas like reading and writing. Endorsement assignments were also discussed; it needs to be made clearer that it's the district's responsibility.

10:13:04 AM

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeanne Harmon, Director, Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP)
It's fortuitous this conversation happened about mentoring and coaching. I would just encourage you to continue to have conversations around the certificate issue. We have not really had much opportunity to talk about it in depth but I want you to know that this proposal about a mentoring certificate has a long history that's based in the reality that you were discussing about the political and

implementation issues that are happening out there in the districts. It so happens that Sue Anderson at OSPI, and me when I was there, and a couple of other people saw this coming a while ago and started having a conversation about what we might do about the fact that people were being placed into mentoring and, at that time mentoring roles and a few coaches, maybe four or five years ago without a lot of thought or sense or support and it looked like things were going to be more dangerous than we wanted. We started talking, so this is really a reality based problem and we started talking to legislators about it and they said, "We don't know what these people do and we don't know if they're any good at what they do and we don't know how we would use them so why would we pay for them?" One of the first things we then said was, "We really need some standards around this." Sue is going to talk this afternoon about mentoring and in that the standards document in front of you we've tried to frame some things around the skills and knowledge for those people who support new teachers in particular. We also are having process work around trying to coordinate a similar product to define what the skills and knowledge are of the people who work as instructional coaches and the relationship between them because new teachers especially get squished between the expectations of those folks.

I want you to know that this proposal about a certificate or, I think we talked at one point about it being an endorsement instead of a certificate because actually we've been kicking it around for a while, but some of the questions that Nasue put forward to you are questions because we haven't really had a policy environment to talk about it yet and I'd love for us, this group, and Sue and I if that's possible and anybody else from OSPI who want to play at this game, to talk more about how this might play out and what it is that it should be. But I want you to know that we wanted it to be based in performance so some of the conversations you are having about who and how and who's deciding and all those things, we think are kind of irrelevant because if we create a performance based assessment of some sort and we have a set of standards we agree on and someone can demonstrate that they meet those standards, then we think it would be great for them to have something that says that they've done that and it would still be up to the districts to decide how to hire them and how to place them, etc, etc, etc. I would love at some other point to have a conversation, a really in depth conversation, about this because we need to do that. We've been talking about it at OSPI for months and months to coordinate coaches in all those different programs; special education, ELL, literacy, math, but we haven't really many other ways, any other audiences.

That's the first thing, the other thing is that actually really came to talk about was, there's a piece in front of you called Teachers Voices Strengthening the Profession Through Writing and I just wanted to leave that with you today. The Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP) actually supports a writing retreat for classroom teachers every year and what you have here are some selections from the year 2004 and 2005; its our first pretty version of this, some pieces have been on the web site for a while. Many of these have been published in other kinds of places; we have people who will write with the intent to actually publish in professional journals. We do this every year, it will be August 6-9 this year in Leavenworth and if you are interested or know someone who would be interested in participating in this, the application will probably be on our web site right after Christmas, so I encourage you to think about that. If you have a need or desire to have more copies of this beautiful thing, please just let me know. Thank you.

10:18:58 AM

MOTION

The PESB reaffirms its positions on the issues that were discussed and authorize our staff members to carry those positions forward in the next legislative session along with its discussions about the WA Learns proposals. ***Motion carried.***

10:35:18 AM

Dr. Douglas reminded the members about upcoming site visits and asked for volunteers for those dates not yet covered by a PESB member.

- Walla Walla College – December 3-6, 2006; Kay Nelson
- Argosy – December 13-14, 2006; Stacey Valentin
- University of Washington - Tacoma – January 21-24, 2007; Roger Erskine
- Central Washington University – May 5-9, 2007; Donna Zickuhr

A few members signed up for site visit training through OSPI; the next classes are expected to be available in February 2007. Those who need training before then should contact Dr. Hett to coordinate one-on-one training session.

10:40:01 AM

REPORT AND OPTIONS FOR FUTURE PESB ACTION: USE OF CERTIFICATION FEES

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

The PESB's responsibilities include ensuring certification fees are well spent, within the constraints set in law. In keeping with the PESB's mission to uphold the highest possible standards for our profession, our interest is ensuring they are well spent toward continuous improvement of preparation and professional practice. Staff made efforts to secure involvement of ESDs in today's discussion. The conflict with the WSSDA conference played a role in that not occurring.

Dr. Hett introduced two of her staff members in audience; Sue Anderson and Colleen Putaansuu. Colleen replaces Connie; she's been a 2nd and 4th grade teacher, and was a principal in the Yelm school district.

Dr. Hett spoke to the annual report required of OSPI related to expenditure of certification fees. This was an issue the State Board strongly encouraged the PESB to pursue when their authority was handed to us.

There are two uses for cert fees; preservice and inservice; 50% for each. There are currently 58 Professional Education Advisory Boards (PEABs) which includes over 900 K12 practitioners as members. A large amount of funding is needed for these meetings, including travel and substitute reimbursement expenses for the teachers.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members questioned the origin of this money; it's all collected through certification fees. The amount is decreasing because the number of certificates is decreasing. Current certification fees range from \$1 to \$70; this fee structure was capped by Initiative 601. Members also questioned whether the PESB could benefit from any of these fees if there is a specific need; that's a possibility and would need to be negotiated with OSPI. Members support the use of these fees for a number of things such as the assessment conferences and other meetings around certification. Maybe some of these fees should be used to reimburse higher education for some of these expenses as well. Concern was expressed over having any large carry-over amounts from year to year and it was suggested to look at more long term planning that would claim those dollars for future plans, such as professional development activities

11:20:19 AM

REQUEST FROM WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY TO REVISE THEIR STATE SITE VISIT SCHEDULE TO ALIGN WITH APPROVED REVISIONS TO THEIR NCATE SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Dr. Hett supports Washington State University's request to align its state educator program site visit date with that of NCATE. The next state site visit would be scheduled for spring 2008. NCATE has already approved their request.

11:22:25 AM

MOTION

Approve Washington State University's request to postpone their state site visit to spring 2008.

Motion carried.

11:22:37 AM

WEST-B EXEMPTION FOR NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFIED TEACHERS

Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments, PESB

Ms. Baker provided a brief update on her presentation at the September board meeting and highlighted what was included in the member packets. As directed by the PESB in July 2006, a motion is being presented that revises *WAC 181-01-002 WEST-B Exemption* to include an exemption for out-of-state candidates who hold a certificate from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members spoke to both sides; some believe there should be an exemption, others do not. Rationale for supporting the motion is that this would be a "gatekeeper". Members suggested slight revisions to the WAC as written for clarity. Suggestions were accepted and the revised language is reflected in the motion.

11:36:15 AM

MOTION

Move to revise WAC 181-01-002 WEST-B Exemption to include an exemption for out-of-state candidates who hold a certificate from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The shaded area shows how the revised WAC would read:

WAC 181-01-002 WEST-B exemptions. (1) Candidates who are prepared and/or certified out-of-state applying for a Washington state residency teaching certificate under WAC ~~180-79A-257 (1)(b)~~ 181-79A-257(1)(b) or WAC 181-79A-260, or out-of-state candidates applying to masters-degree level teacher preparation programs residing outside of the state of Washington at time of application, in lieu of passing the WEST-B, may provide official documentation of scores on the Praxis I of 177 for the reading subtest, 176 for the

mathematics subtest and 174 for the writing subtest, or scores on the Praxis I CBT computer-administered test of 325 for the reading subtest, 321 for the mathematics subtest, and 321 for the writing subtest, or passing scores from California or Oregon on the CBEST.

(2) Candidates applying for a Washington state residency or professional teaching certificate under WAC 181-79A-257(1)(b) who hold a certificate through the national board for professional teaching standards are exempt from the WEST-B requirement.

Motion carried.

12:48:45 PM

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT: WEST-B AND WEST-E

Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments, PESB

RCW 28A.410.240 requires the PESB to prepare an annual assessment report that is made available through the state library, on the website of OSPI, and placed on the legislative alert list.

Ms. Baker summarized the report members received in their packet. She provided a PowerPoint presentation that pulled vital information from the larger report. The report is much larger this year because it includes both WEST-B and WEST-E data.

Go to <http://www.pesb.wa.gov/Publications/reports/index.htm> to view the final report and to view reports from prior years or, if preferred, hard copies are available from the PESB office upon request.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members discussed questions related to passing scores, out of state candidates and specific endorsement area tests. Some of the WEST-E tests will be different when the new vendor tests are put into place.

1:28:44 PM

UPDATE: TEACHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (TAP)

Sue Anderson, Teacher Assistance Program Coordinator, OSPI

Ms. Anderson gave a PowerPoint presentation: More Swimming, Less Sinking: Supporting New Teachers in WA. She gave some background information on the program.

- Funded since 1987
- Voluntary for districts, may be voluntary within districts
- \$810 per teacher allotment
- Variation from year to year not that large
- Lose about 25% of teachers before 5 years
- Each lost teacher costs about \$45k [\$30.6 million annually]
- Partnership with CSTP (Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession)
- Teacher induction standards – develop people who are really invested in their profession
- Four new learnings about beginning teacher induction
- What are the essential elements of an effective induction program?
 - Hiring
 - Orientation

- Mentoring
 - Professional development
 - Assessment for learning
 - Mandatory, multiple-year program
- Integrated professional culture – very collaborative
- We're proposing NTAP: Novice Teacher Assistance Program
 - Lake Washington school district currently doing this program
 - 1st year
 - 1:15 teachers
 - 3 days of professional development
 - 1 release day to observe others
 - This costs \$5255 per teacher
 - Phase-in proposal over the next biennium
- Mentor/coaching academies
 - Designed for one year teachers
 - Mentor "roundtables" for mentors and coaches
- Mentor/coach certificate
 - Decision package, along with Pro Cert and NBCT pay proposals
 - Assessment development and pilot in year 1
 - Adjustments and second cohort in year 2

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members discussed questions related to funding, teacher diversity, and mentoring. Concern was expressed over the seemingly insufficient funding proposed. Maybe some of the funding could go towards college preparation programs. There are some things for which a university can't prepare you, which is where mentors can offer valuable information. Higher education institutions work hard to prepare candidates for diversity in a variety of ways and the same concerns are raised by experienced teachers as are raised by novice teachers. There needs to be a state program that all districts can offer to help ease in novice teachers. The PESB expressed their gratitude for all the work being done on this project.

2:04:42 PM

REMOVAL OF 3-YEAR TEACHING EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT ON THE WEST-E EXTENSION

Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments, PESB

Rick Maloney, Associate Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Action is recommended to revise *WAC 181-02-001 WEST-E Time Exemption* to eliminate the 3-year experience requirement.

Ms. Baker presented information in support of removing the 3-year experience requirement. It was included in the WAC because of early concerns that out-of-state applicants, i.e. from Idaho, might come to Washington with an unfair advantage over WA candidates. The out-of-state applicants could practice up to one year without having met the WEST-E requirement which in-state program completers must meet to gain certification. This concern has not been born out because NCLB has made passing a Praxis II exam an expedient option in order to achieve highly qualified status.

When an out of state candidate comes in without 3 years of experience, districts are using an emergency certificate to get them into the classroom. As it currently stands, it seems to be burdening

people who have met the requirement and there is inconsistency between this and the WEST-B requirement.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

There was a lot of discussion around the use of emergency certificates to get out-of-state teachers into positions in a hurry. Some members support the use of these emergency certificates, others do not. Those opposed feel that there are shortages in other professions and they don't "loosen" their standards to accommodate them. Those in support of this motion feel that updating the WAC language will legitimize the process and bring equity to those out-of-state candidates who don't know about Washington State requirements until they move here as opposed to in-state candidates who know the requirement from the beginning.

A motion was made to revise the WAC to eliminate the three year requirement. Motion seconded.

QUESTIONS AND BOARD DISCUSSION

Members discussed the motion and some thoughts were that this action would just clean up the process so WAC can be followed. Some members remain opposed to the motion and feel that doing this doesn't fix the problem and hopes the board looks at the whole issue.

2:47:34 PM

MOTION

Move to revise WAC 181-02-001 WEST-E Time Exemption to eliminate the 3-year requirement. The revised WAC would read:

WAC ~~181-01-003~~ 181-02-001 WEST-E time extension. ~~Individuals~~ Candidates who are prepared and/or certified out of state applying for a Washington state residency or professional teaching certificate based on WAC ~~180-79A-257~~ 181-79A-257(1)(b) and possessing at least three years state certified teaching experience have up to one calendar year from issuance of the temporary permit to pass the WEST-E subject knowledge test, provided they are eligible for a temporary permit under WAC ~~180-79A-128~~ 181-79A-128.

Yes: Roger Erskine, Kathryn Nelson, Dora Noble, Sharon Okamoto, Grant Pelesky, Stephen Rushing, Yvonne Ullas, Stacy Valentin, Jill Van Glubt and Donna Zickuhr (10)

No: June Canty and Dennis Sterner (2)

Abstain: Shannon Espinoza and Ron Scutt (2)

Motion carried.

2:52:52 PM

ANNUAL REPORT: CERTIFICATES ISSUED AND CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL PLACEMENT STATISTICS

Rick Maloney, Associate Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Mr. Maloney provided a PowerPoint presentation on the annual certification update. First, he presented a history of certification, and then personnel placement statistics, followed by certificate issued stats. The source for part one is the teacher database; the actual issuance of certificates.

Mr. Maloney presented lots of data, including the number and type of certificates issued, presented in several different ways. He handed out sheets to all members so they could document questions for discussion at a later date since he didn't have much time remaining.

3:20:36 PM

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FAREWELL

Chair Van Glubt presented a video of Ms. Wallace's finest moments. Several past and present board members shared fond memories of Ms. Wallace, expressed thanks and praised her accomplishments as the Executive Director of the PESB.

Ms. Wallace thanked everyone and shared memories and her vision for the future.

Governor Gary Locke joined the meeting and spoke about Ms. Wallace's role in the establishment of the board and her accomplishments as the Executive Director. A letter from Governor Christine Gregoire was read aloud and several past and present board members and staff presented public comment on Ms. Wallace's behalf.

A proclamation was read aloud, and then a motion was made to approve the proclamation. Motion seconded.

3:53:41 PM

MOTION

BE IT PROCLAIMED by the PESB as follows:

WHEREAS, Jennifer Wallace provided outstanding leadership and service to the Professional Educator Standards Board from 2000 through 2006; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Wallace has demonstrated outstanding leadership skills in advocating on behalf of the PESB with stakeholder organizations, OSPI, and legislators; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Wallace has been a tireless supporter of educator quality in the state of Washington; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Wallace played an instrumental role in helping to expand the role of the PESB as a policy agency for the state of Washington; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Wallace can mesmerize a karaoke crowd with her rendition of Bonnie Raitt's "Let's Give Them Something to Talk About;" and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Wallace can deliver more words in any given two minute period than should be humanly possible; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Wallace will always be remembered as an integral part of the heart and soul of this board in its early years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED, that the Professional Educator Standards Board offers sincere thanks and wishes Jennifer continued professional success in her new role with The Evergreen State College; and

BE IT FURTHER PROCLAIMED, that this proclamation be presented to Jennifer Wallace, our friend and respected colleague, and that a copy be made part of the official records of the Professional Educator Standards Board.

ADOPTED AND DATED this 17th day of November, 2006.

SIGNED by former Chair Kay A. Nelson, and current Chair, Jill Van Glubt.

Motion carried.

3:57:52 PM

Chair Van Glubt adjourns the meeting.

Attachment A – Public Comment

DISCUSSION: NEW STATE STANDARDS AND EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR STATE-APPROVED PROVIDERS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION (CLOCK HOURS)

My name is David Quinn, and I'm a certified teacher in the Edmonds School District, proudly represented by both the EEA and the WEA. I've been teaching for 9 years now, after receiving a Masters from the University of Washington and completing certification there. I've been involved with a variety of committee work focused on reform, in particular the Teachers for a New Era at UW.

I know that you are not specifically discussing the state's clock hours system, but as I saw it on the agenda, and since you were in Seattle today, I thought I would take this opportunity. In my opinion, the clock hours system is fundamentally broken and fails to serve educators seeking quality professional development experiences.

I have had a variety of experiences with the current system that have led me to this conclusion, and I'd like to relate them to you at this time. When I was first employed by the Edmonds District, I was sent off to Dallas upon my hiring so that I could become certified in Pacesetter English, the College Board's Senior English program. After completing an initial certification process that lasted for a week, including work that I was required to complete after coming home, I sent documentation for my hours to our district office. I attended another training session that December. Immediately after returning home, though, I was contacted by the College Board again, with an offer to return for a third round of training – this time to become a trainer myself. All in all, I completed well over 75 hours of training. Later in the year, however, when I went to check my employee file, I discovered that I wasn't going to get credit for any of my time. The reason: The College Board was not approved by the state to grant clock hours. The idea itself was hysterical to me. The College Board – the creator of the AP test, the AP seminar, and the Pacesetter program – could not issue clock hours for its training. I was upset that my district had failed to inform me that none of the hours would count, but the painful strike arrived after that. A year later, I was offered clock hours if I had attended an AP seminar being led by a teacher in our district. This teacher had no special certification from AP, but had been teaching AP for a while. SHE could give me hours, but the College Board – the creator of the materials – couldn't. Later, in an effort to get re-certified, I had to purchase course credits, as the largest chunk of my professional development hours was worthless to the state.

My next horrid encounter with our system came years later, but was an even crueler blow. This past summer, after a demanding application and critical selection process, I was fortunate to be selected to attend a month-long NEH seminar for teachers. It remains, to this day, the most substantial professional development of my career. For almost a month, I lived and breathed Shakespeare with some of the world's leading scholars, including the archaeologist of the Globe and a MacArthur Award-winning educational scholar and performer. Held at Smith College, the institute was both critically-engaging and immensely practical. It wasn't until I arrived, though, that I remembered to contact the state. I can't say I was surprised by the answer I was given over the phone: The National Endowment for the Humanities, "the agency of the United States government dedicated to supporting research, education, preservation, and public programs in the humanities" is NOT an approved provider for clock hours in the state of Washington. That's right: The federal government's agency dedicated to public programs can't issue clock hours. That wasn't the worst of it, though. Getting credit for the month actually cost me an additional \$500, as I had to purchase graduate credits just to get the experience on my record. In the end, I was the ONLY teacher in residence who was not having their time immediately recognized by their local or state authority. The gentleman I spoke to on the phone at OSPI took pity on me and we had a good laugh about it, primarily because I wasn't the worst story he'd ever heard. The worst was the person who attended a seminar run by Harvard's

School of Education. That teacher didn't get any hours, either. Harvard University, it turns out, can't issue clock hours in Washington State, either.

Again, to add an additional layer of abuse to my tale, when I returned home and bemoaned the situation with my fellow teachers, we were struck by more irony: I could sit with members of my department one afternoon and provide them with instructional techniques for Shakespeare based on my summer experiences and THAT would earn us all hours. The experience itself – all 120 hours of it – was earning me ZERO hours, but if I sat and had coffee with my peers and took them through the month...THAT was going to get me hours!

From where I sit, the current system is unreasonable and absurd, both in its current design and execution. My own peers will tell you that there is no reward at all for seeking thoughtful experiences; instead, we are given endless opportunities to earn hours in 2-hour blocks. Let me be clear: Meaningful professional development cannot occur in two hours, and anyone who tells you that they can provide worthwhile, high-level training during that amount of time is lying to you. It can be the beginning of something larger, of course. But I'm regularly offered – and take advantage of – clock-hour offer experiences that are terminal 2 or 3-hour encounters. Ultimately, in my opinion at least, since the measurement is only in time, this body is actually reinforcing the idea that teachers should value the “downest” and “dirtiest” hours we can get: the cheapest experiences. It isn't bad enough that I am forced to obtain 15 credits every certification period JUST TO KEEP MY JOB. No, the worst part is that I have to pay FULL RETAIL to do it. Given the cost of credits at a 4-year institution, I have to give up, essentially, a month's salary every five years just to keep my job. Teachers don't get any break on the price of the credits, even though the state forces me back into the classroom to keep my job. So what should I do? Pay \$3000, a month's take-home salary, to keep my certification? Or just sit through some ridiculous, meaningless session, albeit one that allows me to “check the relevant boxes” on the clock hours verification form.

As you work to review our state's clock hour system, I hope you keep my thoughts in mind. Many people like to point out the most ridiculous clock hour chicanery and declare that we have to “tighten up the system and close the loopholes.” Instead of doing that, try creating a system that values accredited institutions, leading national agencies, and meaningful experiences. By working with teachers on achievable goals for professional development and continuing certification, this body can serve the most important people of all in this equation: our students.

-David Quinn